DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 081 UD 026 313

TITLE Recent Oversight Experience in ECIA Chapter 1 Programs. OERI Bulletin.
INSTITUTION Center for Education Statistics (OERI/ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO CS-87-423b
PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; National Surveys; Program Administration; Program Content; *Program Evaluation; Rural Urban Differences; School District Size; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Program Monitoring

ABSTRACT

An estimated 13,600 public school districts nationwide (90 percent) have Chapter 1 compensatory education programs, funded under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. Nearly all of these districts (97 percent) had State oversight visits (compliance reviews and program audits) from Fall 1982 to Spring 1986. A recent survey of these oversight visits revealed the following: (1) urban districts and large districts (10,000 or more students) had more visits than rural or small districts (less than 2,500 students); (2) 92 percent of school districts with Chapter 1 programs had at least one State monitoring review, and 84 percent had at least one State audit; (3) on average, school districts had 2.3 State monitoring reviews and 2.1 State audits; and (4) each of the 13 Chapter 1 program areas were included in over 80 percent of the districts, and seven of the areas had been reviewed in over 90 percent of the districts. Areas more likely to be reviewed in urban than rural districts, and areas more likely to be reviewed in large than small districts are identified. The most recent State audit was conducted either by a State Education Agency official, or by an accountant under contract with the school district. Over half of the districts reported that their most recent State audit was conducted as a district-wide audit, rather than as an audit specific to the Chapter 1 program. Survey methodology and data reliability are discussed. Data are presented on seven tables. Appendices define Chapter 1 program areas and present the survey instrument. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

8-9-88

ED297081

BULLETIN OERI

U.S. Department of Education • Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Center for Education Statistics

Contact: Helen Ashwick
202-357-6761

March 1987

Recent Oversight Experience in ECIA Chapter 1 Programs

An estimated 13,600 public school districts nationwide (90 percent) have Chapter 1 compensatory education programs, funded under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA). Nearly all of these districts (97 percent) had State oversight visits (compliance reviews and program audits) during the period from the beginning of the 1982-83 school year through the spring of 1986. Urban districts and large districts (10,000 or more students) had more oversight visits than rural or small districts (less than 2,500 students).

These are some of the findings of a recent survey performed under contract with Westat, Inc., for the Center for Education Statistics (CES), U.S. Department of Education, through its Fast Response Survey System (FRSS).[1] The survey was requested by the Office of Research (OR) within the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and is one component of a national assessment of Chapter 1 programs being conducted by OR for a report to Congress.

The Chapter 1 Assessment

Compensatory education programs have been funded by the Federal government since the Title I program was established under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The program was modified in October 1981 under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) and was implemented in the 1982-83 school year as the Chapter 1 program. In general, the 1981 changes to the program were designed to provide more flexibility in program regulations and to relieve unnecessary administrative burden. The new program regulations include requirements for audits to be conducted by the State or by an independent accountant at least biennially. While State monitoring reviews to determine program compliance (which were required under Title I) are not required under Chapter 1, these reviews are still conducted by virtually all States.

---

[1] CES's Fast Response Survey System is a special service that, upon request, quickly obtains nationally representative, policy-relevant data from small surveys to meet the needs of U.S. Department of Education policy officials.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD026313

In December 1983, Congress passed technical amendments to Chapter 1 requiring that the Secretary of Education "conduct a national assessment of compensatory education assisted under [ECIA Chapter 1], through independent studies and analysis by the National Institute of Education [now OR]." This assessment is in progress and includes case studies and surveys at the State, district, and school levels. Because of the potential sensitivity of questions concerning oversight activities, it was decided to conduct this aspect of the assessment separately under the Fast Response Survey System. The FRSS survey obtained information on Chapter 1 oversight activities and focused on the most recent activities that had occurred in the period between implementation of Chapter 1 (1982-83) and the time of the survey (February-April, 1986).

Numbers and Types of Chapter 1 Oversight Visits

Ninety-two percent of school districts with Chapter 1 programs had at least one State monitoring review,[2] and 84 percent had at least one State audit[3] in the period from the 1982-83 school year through spring 1986 (not shown in tables). On average, school districts had 2.3 State monitoring reviews and 2.1 State audits during this period (table 1). The average number of State monitoring reviews was higher among large school districts (4.0 visits) than medium and small districts (2.4 and 2.2 visits, respectively). The average was also higher among urban districts (5.9 visits) than among suburban or rural districts (2.4 and 2.2 visits, respectively). However, there were no differences in the number of State audits between districts of different size or metropolitan status.[4]

About three fourths (78 percent) of the districts reported that their most recent State monitoring review was conducted in the last two school years, and 89 percent reported that their most recent State audit occurred in the last two years (not shown in tables).

Most Recent Chapter 1 State Monitoring Review

School districts were asked to report which of 13 Chapter 1 program areas[5] were included in their most recent State monitoring review. Each of the 13 program areas had been reviewed in over 80 percent of the districts, and 7 of the areas had been reviewed in over 90 percent of districts (table 2).

---

[2] State monitoring reviews are on-site visits to school districts by State Chapter 1 personnel to determine compliance with Chapter 1 program requirements.

[3] State audits are formal audits of a Chapter 1 program to fulfill an audit mandate, conducted on-site by either State officials or public accountants contracted by the State or school district.

[4] Tabulations were produced by district enrollment size, metropolitan status, and region. Only comparisons by district enrollment and metropolitan status are reported in this bulletin; regional data, however, are included in some tables.

[5] See attachment A for a listing and definitions of these areas.

Some differences in the areas reviewed were observed between types of districts (table 3). The following areas were somewhat more likely to be reviewed in urban than rural districts:

- Nonpublic participation,
- Supplement-not-supplant,
- Preparation of the application,
- Management, budget systems, and recordkeeping,
- Parent involvement,
- School attendance area eligibility and targeting, and
- Comparability.

Nonpublic participation, supplement-not-supplant, and coordination with other education programs were more likely to be reviewed in large than small districts.

Relatively few program changes were made as a result of recent State monitoring reviews. The proportion of districts in which program changes were made ranged from only 3 to 12 percent of the districts in which the program areas had been reviewed (table 2).

Most Recent Chapter 1 State Audit

In general, program areas were less likely to be included in State audits than in State monitoring reviews (table 2). With one exception, the frequency with which program areas were audited ranged from 51 percent (coordination with other education programs) to 69 percent (school attendance area eligibility and targeting) of the districts. The exception was management, budget systems, and recordkeeping, which was audited in 92 percent of districts.

As was found in monitoring reviews, districts varied in the program areas included in the most recent State audit. The following program areas were more likely to be audited in large districts than in small districts (table 4):

- Comparability,
- Nonpublic participation,
- Supplement-not-supplant,

- School attendance area eligibility and targeting, and
- Student selection.

The same program areas were audited in proportionately more urban than rural districts. In addition, parent involvement and needs assessment/evaluation were more likely to be audited in urban than in rural districts. As with monitoring reviews, relatively few districts reported making changes in their Chapter 1 program as a result of recent State audits. Across program areas, only 3 to 10 percent of the districts in which the areas had been audited made any changes (table 2).

Who Conducts Chapter 1 State Audits

The most recent State audit was generally conducted by a State Education Agency (SEA) official (49 percent of districts) or by an accountant under contract with the school district (44 percent). Urban districts were more likely to be audited by an accountant under contract with the district, while suburban and rural districts were more likely to be audited by an SEA official (table 5).

Trend toward District-Wide Audits

Over half of the districts (56 percent) reported that their most recent State audit was conducted as part of a district-wide audit,[6] rather than an audit specific to the Chapter 1 program (table 6). Large districts were more likely than small districts to report a district-wide audit.

The use of Chapter 1 specific audits is decreasing, according to district-reported data. Over half (58 percent) of the districts whose most recent audit was in 1982-83 or 1983-84 reported that the audit was specific to the Chapter 1 program. However, of districts reporting their most recent audit in 1984-85 or 1985-86, the percent with Chapter 1 specific audits had declined to 43 and 39 percent, respectively (not shown in tables).

Thoroughness of Chapter 1 Oversight Activities

Districts were asked to compare the thoroughness of reviews and audits under Chapter 1 with those conducted under Title I. Responses for both reviews and audits were quite similar.

---

[6] The Single Audit Act (P.L. 98-502) became effective for a State's fiscal year beginning after December 31, 1984. Information provided by OR presents a somewhat different picture on the status of district-wide audits. In the Report on Changes Under Chapter 1 of ECIA prepared for the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives, September, 1985, "Thirty-eight [State Chapter 1] directors reported that combined audits have been implemented in their States." The differences between the two sets of data may have occurred for a variety of reasons, including differences in the type of respondent (State coordinators vs. district coordinators), phrasing of the questions, and survey methodology.

About half of the districts indicated that reviews and audits were equally thorough under Title I and Chapter 1; about 40 percent said that oversight activities were more thorough under Chapter 1; and 10 percent said oversight activities had been more thorough under Title I (table 7). Small and medium-sized districts were more likely than large districts to state that reviews were more thorough under Chapter 1. Suburban and rural districts were more likely than urban districts to state that audits were more thorough under Chapter 1.

Survey Methodology and Data Reliability

In February 1986, questionnaires (attachment B) were mailed to a national probability sample of 701 public school districts representing the 15,152 school districts in the Nation. The sampling frame used for this survey was the 1984-85 Common Core of Data Universe of Public School Systems. The universe was stratified by enrollment size, and sample units were selected with equal probability within each stratum. Sampling rates for the strata were constructed to be proportionate to the square root of the average enrollment for the strata. The survey was a mail survey with telephone followup. Data collection was completed in April with a response rate of 96 percent. Data were adjusted for questionnaire nonresponse and weighted to national totals.

Since the estimates were obtained from a sample of districts, they are subject to sampling variability. The standard error of an estimate is a measure of the variability between the values of the estimate calculated from different samples and the value of the statistic in the population. Standard errors can be used to examine the precision obtained in a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.645 standard errors below to 1.645 standard errors above a particular statistic would include the average result of these samples in approximately 90 percent of the cases. For example, for the first item in the table (mean number of State monitoring reviews), the estimate is 2.3 and the standard error is 0.2. The 90 percent confidence interval for this statistic extends from 2.3 - 0.2 times 1.645 to 2.3 + 0.2 times 1.645, or from 2.0 to 2.6.

Estimates of standard errors for the estimates were computed using a balanced half sampling technique, known as balanced repeated replications. Some representative statistics and their estimated standard errors are included in table 8. Statements of comparison made in this report were tested by use of t-tests and are significant at the 90 percent confidence level or better.

Survey estimates are also subject to errors of reporting and errors made in the collection of the data. These errors, called nonsampling errors, can sometimes bias the data. While general sampling theory can be used to determine how to estimate the sampling variability of a statistic, nonsampling errors are not easy to measure and usually require that an experiment be conducted as part of the data collection procedures or the use of data external to the study. There were no provisions in the contract to attempt to measure nonsampling errors.

Data are presented for all districts and by the following district characteristics: district enrollment, metropolitan status, and region. Metropolitan status is defined as follows: urban districts are those within city limits; suburban districts are those within an SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area), but outside a city; rural districts are all other or districts outside an SMSA. Region classifications are those used by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S.

Department of Commerce, the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and the National Education Association. The North Atlantic includes districts in CT, DE, DC, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, and VT. The Great Lakes and Plains includes districts in IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, and WI. The Southeast includes districts in AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV. The West and Southwest includes districts in AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, and WY.

The survey was performed under contract with Westat, Inc., using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). Westat's Project Director was Elizabeth Farris, and the Survey Manager was Mary Collins. Douglas Wright was the CES Project Officer during the design of the survey, and Helen Ashwick was the Project Officer during the data collection, analysis, and report writing phases. The OR data requesters, who participated in the design and analyses, were Marty Orland and Richard Jung. FRSS was established by CES to collect quickly, and with minimum burden on respondents, small quantities of data needed for education planning and policy.

For More Information

For information about this survey or the Fast Response Survey System, contact Helen Ashwick, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Center for Education Statistics, 555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20208, telephone (202) 357-6761.

Table 1.--Mean number of Chapter 1 oversight visits from 1982-83 to spring 1986, by district characteristics: United States, 1985-86

District characteristic	State monitoring reviews	State audits
Total.....	2.3	2.1
District enrollment		
Less than 2,500.....	2.2	2.1
2,500 - 9,999.....	2.4	2.2
10,000 or more.....	4.0	2.3
Metropolitan status		
Urban.....	5.9	2.7
Suburban.....	2.4	2.0
Rural.....	2.2	2.2
Region		
North Atlantic.....	2.4	2.1
Great Lakes and Plains.	2.1	2.1
Southeast.....	4.0	2.6
West and Southwest.....	1.8	2.0

NOTE.--Means are based on districts that had Chapter 1 programs and include districts reporting no monitoring reviews or audits.

Table 2.--Percent of districts reporting that various program areas had been included in the most recent Chapter 1 State monitoring review and audit, and changes made as a result: United States, 1985-86

Program area[1]	State monitoring review		State audit	
	Area reviewed[2]	Change made as result of review[3]	Area audited[2]	Change made as result of audit[3]
School attendance area eligibility/targeting..	93	5	69	5
Comparability.....	86	5	60	3
Nonpublic participation..	84	9	58	4
Student selection.....	95	10	63	7
Needs assessment/ evaluation.....	94	11	61	9
Parent involvement.....	93	12	56	9
Supplement-not-supplant.....	91	6	64	5
Maintenance of effort.....	87	3	67	3
Preparation of the application.....	87	10	60	9
Program design.....	93	11	58	8
Management/budget systems/recordkeeping..	91	10	92	10
Coordination with other programs.....	81	7	51	5
Training of staff and others.....	86	9	53	5

[1]See attachment A for definitions of the Chapter 1 program areas and their applicability. School attendance area eligibility/targeting was inapplicable in 22 percent of districts, comparability in 33 percent, and nonpublic participation in 42 percent.

[2]Percents are based on the number of districts that had a Chapter 1 State monitoring review (N=12,288) or a State audit (N=11,523) and for whom the program area was applicable.

[3]Percents are based on the number of districts in which the program area was reviewed or audited.

Table 3.--Percent of districts reporting that various program areas had been reviewed in the most recent Chapter 1 State monitoring review, by district characteristics: United States, 1985-86

Program area*	District enrollment			Metropolitan status		
	Less than 2,500	2,500 - 9,999	10,000 or more	Urban	Suburban	Rural
School attendance area eligibility/targeting...	92	95	95	100	94	92
Comparability.....	82	93	88	94	91	82
Nonpublic participation...	79	91	95	98	92	77
Student selection.....	94	95	99	100	95	94
Needs assessment/ evaluation.....	94	95	99	96	97	93
Parent involvement.....	91	96	97	100	96	91
Supplement-not-supplant...	90	92	98	100	92	89
Maintenance of effort.....	87	89	90	91	89	86
Preparation of the application.....	86	88	90	97	86	86
Program design.....	93	95	98	100	94	93
Management/budget systems/recordkeeping...	91	91	92	100	93	90
Coordination with other programs.....	79	86	90	82	84	81
Training of staff and others.....	85	91	88	89	86	86

*See attachment A for definitions of the Chapter 1 program areas.

NOTE.--Percents are based on the number of districts that had a Chapter 1 State monitoring review and for whom the program area was applicable.

Table 4.--Percent of districts reporting that various program areas had been audited in the most recent Chapter 1 State audit, by district characteristics: United States, 1985-86

Program area*	District enrollment			Metropolitan status		
	Less than 2,500	2,500 - 9,999	10,000 or more	Urban	Suburban	Rural
School attendance area eligibility targeting...	69	67	82	85	73	67
Comparability.....	56	64	79	86	67	54
Nonpublic participation...	55	59	74	83	63	52
Student selection.....	63	61	76	82	64	63
Needs assessment/ evaluation.....	62	59	70	77	62	61
Parent involvement.....	56	53	60	70	60	54
Supplement-not-supplant...	62	66	79	87	70	60
Maintenance of effort.....	66	68	74	73	72	65
Preparation of the application.....	62	55	61	64	60	60
Program design.....	56	56	62	66	59	55
Management/budget systems/recordkeeping...	91	95	97	97	95	91
Coordination with other programs.....	50	54	56	55	58	48
Training of staff and others.....	53	53	53	61	56	52

*See attachment A for definitions of the Chapter 1 program areas.

NOTE.--Percents are based on the number of districts that had a Chapter 1 State audit and for whom the program area was applicable.

Table 5.--Percent of districts whose most recent Chapter 1 State audit was conducted by various officials, by district characteristics: United States, 1985-86

District characteristic	State education agency official	Other State official	Accountant under State contract	Accountant under district contract	Other person
Total.....	49	17	6	44	2
District enrollment					
Less than 2,500.....	51	14	4	42	2
2,500 - 9,999.....	43	25	10	47	0
10,000 or more.....	48	17	9	51	2
Metropolitan status					
Urban.....	34	16	9	68	1
Suburban.....	52	18	6	44	*
Rural.....	48	17	6	42	2
Region					
North Atlantic.....	50	17	11	51	0
Great Lakes and Plains..	48	11	4	44	3
Southeast.....	41	42	6	28	3
West and Southwest.....	55	12	5	44	*

*Less than 1 percent.

NOTE.--Percents are based on the number of districts that had a Chapter 1 State audit. Respondents checked all appropriate categories; therefore, percents sum to more than 100.

Table 6.--Percent of districts that had Chapter 1 specific and district-wide audits, by district characteristics: United States, 1985-86

District characteristic	Chapter 1 specific	District-wide	Both*
Total.....	43	56	1
District enrollment			
Less than 2,500.....	47	53	1
2,500 - 9,999.....	32	64	4
10,000 or more.....	27	73	0
Metropolitan status			
Urban.....	32	68	0
Suburban.....	45	53	2
Rural.....	42	57	1
Region			
North Atlantic.....	53	45	2
Great Lakes and Plains.	43	56	1
Southeast.....	29	70	1
West and Southwest.....	40	58	2

*A small number of districts checked both Chapter 1 specific and district-wide.

NOTE.--Percents are based on the number of districts that had a Chapter 1 State audit. Percents may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Table 7.--Districts' perceptions of the thoroughness of State monitoring reviews and audits under Title I and Chapter 1, by district characteristics: United States, 1985-86

District characteristic	Monitoring reviews			Audits		
	More thorough under Title I	About the same	More thorough under Chapter 1	More thorough under Title I	About the same	More thorough under Chapter 1
	(Percent of districts)*					
Total.....	10	49	41	11	51	38
District enrollment						
Less than 2,500.....	9	49	41	11	52	38
2,500 - 9,999.....	14	44	43	10	48	42
10,000 or more.....	11	60	29	13	56	31
Metropolitan status						
Urban.....	22	46	33	15	61	24
Suburban.....	10	51	39	11	48	41
Rural.....	10	47	43	10	52	38
Region						
North Atlantic.....	13	43	44	7	43	49
Great Lakes and Plains	8	54	38	9	62	29
Southeast.....	13	46	42	15	46	40
West and Southwest.....	11	46	43	14	45	41

*Based on the number of districts that had Chapter 1 State monitoring reviews or audits from which there were valid responses. About 14 percent of the districts were unable to respond to this item, either because the district did not have a Title I program, or the program director was not present when the district had Title I. These districts are not included in the percents. Percents may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Item	Estimate	Standard error
Mean number of State monitoring reviews		
All districts	2.3	0.2
Urban districts	5.9	1.5
Rural districts	2.2	0.1
Mean number of State audits		
All districts	2.1	0.1
Large districts	2.3	0.1
Small districts	2.1	0.1
Percent of districts audited by a State Education Agency official		
All districts	49.2	2.8
Urban districts	34.5	7.5
Rural districts	47.7	3.6
Percent of districts audited by an accountant under district contract		
All districts	43.7	2.9
Large districts	51.2	5.6
Small districts	42.4	3.6
Percent of districts whose last audit was Chapter 1 specific		
All districts	42.6	2.4
Urban districts	31.6	7.8
Rural districts	42.0	3.1
Percent of districts whose last audit was district-wide		
All districts	56.1	2.3
Large districts	73.0	5.4
Small districts	52.6	3.1
Percent of districts in which program area was reviewed		
Attendance area eligibility/targeting	92.8	1.3
Nonpublic participation	84.0	2.2
Student selection	94.6	1.3
Supplement-not-supplant	90.6	1.5
Maintenance of effort	87.3	1.6
Management, budget, and recordkeeping	90.9	1.5
Percent of districts in which program area was audited		
Attendance area eligibility/targeting	69.5	2.4
Nonpublic participation	57.5	3.2
Student selection	63.1	2.4
Supplement-not-supplant	63.9	2.5
Maintenance of effort	66.6	2.1
Management, budget, and recordkeeping	92.3	1.7

ATTACHMENT A
CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM AREAS

School attendance area eligibility and targeting: this aspect of the program is concerned with the determination of whether the attendance area of a given school meets the criteria for inclusion in the program, and the determination and selection of attendance areas to be included in the program. This is inapplicable when there is only one school in the district, or only one school in a given grade span, or total district enrollment in less than 1,000 students.

Comparability: each district must ensure that Chapter 1 schools and non-Chapter 1 schools in the district are provided with comparable resources, facilities, and staff. If there is only one school in a district or only one school in a grade span grouping (e.g., K through 6), this area is inapplicable.

Nonpublic participation: under the principle of equitable provision of services, programs must offer services to all eligible school children, including those who attend private schools. Each district must develop an approach to offer and deliver services to these students. This applies to all educationally deprived nonpublic school students who reside in the attendance area(s) selected for participation, even if the school they attend is outside the target area. If no nonpublic school students reside in the eligible attendance areas, this program area is inapplicable.

Student selection: each district must develop a plan to select the students who will receive services based on objective measures of educational need. Criteria to be used in need determination include standardized test scores, teacher perceptions of need, etc. Those in greatest need must be served first.

Needs assessment/evaluation: each district must conduct an annual assessment of educational needs. This assessment should identify the general instructional areas of need (e.g., reading, math, elementary grades) and identify educationally deprived children with such needs. The district must also evaluate program effectiveness at least one time every three years. The evaluation must include an assessment of whether effects are sustained for more than one year.

Parent involvement: in the past, each district had to establish a parents' committee or board to consult on the program. While this requirement has been eliminated, districts are still required to keep parents informed about the program and solicit their input.

Supplement-not-supplant: Chapter 1 programs are designed to provide supplementary services to students in need. These services must be supplemental to those services provided in the regular school program, and may not supplant, or substitute for, normal educational services.

Maintenance of effort: because the Chapter 1 program is supplementary, its funds are not to be used to replace state or local funds for education. The total budget for education in the district (level of effort) or the funding level per student must be maintained.

Preparation of the application: applications for the Chapter 1 program can be for a period of 3 years, with update of some information each year. The application includes all of the key

aspects of the program design, the goals of the program, and budget information, and is submitted to the SEA for approval.

Program design (size, scope, and quality): while many of the program areas listed are part of the program design in some sense, this item is concerned with those aspects of the design which deal with the size of the program (how many students will be served), the scope of the program (what services are provided), and the efforts of the district to ensure the quality of services.

Management/budget systems/recordkeeping: this program area includes the way in which the program is managed, fiscal operations, adequacy of budget systems, and financial and management records.

Coordination with other educational programs: relationship between Chapter 1 services and other services provided to educationally deprived students in the school district.

Training of staff and others: the training in the provision of program services and management of the program.

ATTACHMENT B

FAST RESPONSE SURVEY SYSTEM

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208-1628

Form Approved
OMB No. 1850-0584
App. Exp. 5/84

ECIA CHAPTER 1 OVERSIGHT EXPERIENCE

This report is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

DEFINITIONS:

State Monitoring or Federal Management Reviews: on-site visits to your school district by State or Federal Chapter 1 personnel to determine your compliance with Chapter 1 program requirements.

State or Federal Audit: formal audits of your Chapter 1 program to fulfill an audit mandate, conducted on-site by either State officials, public accountants contracted by the school district or State, or the U.S. Department of Education's Office of the Inspector General. Audits may be district-wide or specific to your Chapter 1 program.

1. Does your school district have a Chapter 1 program? ☐ Yes (CONTINUE) ☐ No (GO TO ITEM 7)

2. For each type of review or audit (see definitions above), please enter the number of visits to your Chapter 1 program from the beginning of school year 1982-83 to the present, and enter the school year of the most recent visit. (If monitoring and auditing visits occurred at the same time, report monitoring and audit activities separately.

a. State monitoring review:	NUMBER OF REVIEWS _____	YEAR OF MOST RECENT REVIEW	198__-8__
b. State conducted or mandated audit:	NUMBER OF AUDITS _____	YEAR OF MOST RECENT AUDIT	198__-8__
c. Federal management review:	NUMBER OF REVIEWS _____	YEAR OF MOST RECENT REVIEW	198__-8__
d. Federal audit:	NUMBER OF AUDITS _____	YEAR OF MOST RECENT AUDIT	198__-8__

[IF YOU HAVE HAD NO CHAPTER 1 STATE AUDIT, GO TO QUESTION 5.]

3. Who conducted the last State audit of your Chapter 1 program? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- ☐ State Education Agency official(s)
- ☐ State official(s) not with the State Education Agency (e.g. State Comptroller's office, or State audit agency)
- ☐ Independent accountant(s) under contract with the State
- ☐ Independent accountant(s) under contract with the school district
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

4. Was this audit specific to the Chapter 1 program or part of a district-wide audit?

☐ Chapter 1 specific ☐ Part of a district-wide audit

5. For your last State monitoring review and/or your last State audit under Chapter 1, please check which of the following program areas were reviewed or audited, and whether changes have been made as a result of the review or audit. In the last column, check program areas in which you made changes as a result of [illegible] report, concerning about reviews or audits in other districts from 1982-83 to the present.

(IF THERE HAS BEEN NO STATE MONITORING REVIEW, CHECK HERE ☐. IF NO STATE AUDIT, CHECK HERE ☐.)
(IF PROGRAM AREAS a, b, OR c DO NOT APPLY TO YOUR DISTRICT, PLACE A CHECK IN THE FIRST COLUMN. ITEM e IS ONLY INAPPLICABLE IF NO NONPUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS RESIDE IN YOUR DISTRICT.)

Chapter 1 Program Area	Program Area Not Applicable to this District	State Monitoring Review in Your District		State Audit In Your District		Change Made as a Result of Federal or State Review/ Audit in Other District(s)?
		Area reviewed	Change made	Area audited	Change made	
a. School attendance area eligibility/targeting						
b. Comparability						
c. Nonpublic participation						
d. Student selection						
e. Needs assessment/evaluation						
f. Parent involvement						
g. Supplement-not-supplant						
h. Maintenance of effort						
i. Preparation of the application						
j. Program design (size, scope, and quality)						
k. Management/budget systems/record keeping						
l. Coordination with other education programs						
m. Training of staff and others						

6. In general, how would you compare the thoroughness of the last State Chapter 1 monitoring review and/or State audit with the last such review or audit under ESEA Title I (i.e., 1981-82 or before)? By thoroughness we mean the degree to which all of your activities and policies were reviewed to determine whether you were in full compliance with the applicable law (Title I or Chapter 1). (CHECK ONE BOX IN EACH COLUMN.)

	State Monitoring Review	State Audit
Much more thorough under Title I		
Somewhat more thorough under Title I		
About the same		
Somewhat more thorough under Chapter 1		
Much more thorough under Chapter 1		
Don't know; was not with Title I program in this district		
Not applicable: did not have Title I in this district		
Not applicable: no Chapter 1 review/audit		

7. Person completing form: _____ Title: _____

School district: _____ State: ___ _____ Phone: (___) ___-_____

INFORMATION COPY ONLY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE